REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20, and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,604,871 issued to Pecone in view of U.S. Publication No. US 2001/0014927 A1 issued to Chang et al.

Claim 1 recites the following:

a motherboard to have a chipset coupled thereto;
a riser card coupled with the motherboard, the riser card having a circuit thereon that interacts with a corresponding portion of the chipset to provide a functionality to the system, the circuit including a hardware component that has a corresponding driver, the riser card also having a memory to store one or more indications of the functionality, wherein the riser card operates as a logical extension of the motherboard; and
a memory to store a sequence of instructions, the memory coupled with the motherboard, the sequence of instructions to cause the driver to be loaded based, at least in part, on the one or more indications of the functionality.

Claims 10 and 19 similarly recite a riser card that has a circuit that includes a hardware component with a corresponding driver and a memory to store a sequence of instructions to cause the driver to be loaded based on the one or more indications of the functionality.

As stated in the Office Action, Pecone fails to teach a memory to store a sequence of instructions to cause a driver to be loaded based on the one or more indications of the functionality. The Office Action also states that Chang does not disclose causing a driver to be loaded. The Office Action goes on to state that paragraph [0001] of Chang discloses a "plug-in" card. Applicants submit that the text of paragraph [0001], which states that the invention of

App. No. 09/607,680
Atty. Docket No. 042390.P8527

7

Filed: June 30, 2000
Examiner: A. Casiano

Chang relates generally to a plug-in card for use with a personal computer, does not teach a memory to store a sequence of instructions to cause a driver to be loaded based on the one or more indications of the functionality.

Neither Pecone nor Chang teaches a riser card that has a circuit that includes a hardware component with a corresponding driver and a memory to store a sequence of instructions to cause the driver to be loaded based on the one or more indications of the functionality. These limitations are expressly recited in claims 1, 10, and 19. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1, 10, and 19 are patentable over Pecone and Chang.

Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27 are patentable over Pecone and Chang for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 3, 12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pecone in view of Chang et al. and further in view of technical disclosure by IBM (Enhanced Riser Card with Expansion Function Capability for Personal Computer, Technical Disclosure Bulletin, July 1994).

As discussed above, neither Pecone nor Chang teaches a riser card that has a circuit that includes a hardware component with a corresponding driver and a memory to store a sequence of instructions to cause the driver to be loaded based on the one or more indications of the functionality, as recited in claims 1-27. The Office Action states that the IBM technical disclosure teaches expanding the functionality of a riser card by including a BIOS and a ROM. Whether or not the IBM technical disclosure teaches these features, the IBM technical disclosure does not teach a riser card that has a circuit that includes a hardware component with a corresponding driver and a memory to store a sequence of instructions to cause the driver to be

loaded based on the one or more indications of the functionality. Therefore, the IBM technical disclosure does not cure the deficiencies of Pecone and Chang. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3, 12, and 21 are patentable over Pecone, Chang, and the IBM technical disclosure.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 2/5/0Y

Lisa Tom
Reg. No. 52,291

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200